

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4 and 7-10 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zetts (U.S. Patent 5,404,458) in view of Reference "DSP-Based Handprinted Character Recognition" (Texas Instrument Application Report, October 1994, by Alan Josephson, hereinafter "Josephson"). The Examiner has rejected Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Josephson in view of Zetts et al. (U.S. Patent 5,864,635).

Additionally, the Examiner has objected to Claim 10 because of an informality. Claim 10 improperly depends upon Claim "5" rather than properly depending upon Claim 9. Claim 10 has been amended to properly depend on Claim 9. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is presented with the following information to assist in recognizing the distinguishing elements of the claims of the present application from the cited references. First, please note that as disclosed in the present application, there is provided a method for performing character recognition without delay, because, as disclosed, when data output from a touch screen is recognized as a character, the data is considered as one stroke, as opposed to multiple and individual strokes. Also, as disclosed in the present application, if touch screen data is output within the predetermined time period, the same is considered as one character, and not as multiple and individual strokes.

As disclosed in the present application, each character (alphabet and numeral) becomes one model as a result of training and the same forms a model database to be thereby employed in recognition software. If an operator writes a character on the touch screen, the strokes are numerically represented as a set of discrete points and it is inputted to a recognition system. Since the stroke is a set of discontinuous points, strokes are thinned so that not all points are retained. In addition, the stroke should be normalized in order to compare it with the stroke of the stroke database and such that the sequence of strokes is analyzed for a set of potential symbols using the models of database to determine if there is a match. That is, the sequence of strokes is a match for one symbol.

Herein, it is one word, not one character and it should be noted that a noun or verb of the word can be single or plural.

According to the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Josephson, on page 4 lines 17 to 18, teaches that a character recognition speed is increased. According to the Josephson, the confusion between numerals 0, 1, 5 and the alphabet is prevented by using a context-sensitive dictionary, and not the system and method of the present application.

Independent Claim 3 recites, in part, “a character recognition processor for performing character recognition of the stored touch screen data at each time when each stroke is input through said touch screen, wherein all the touch screen data are recognized as a single character when said predetermined waiting threshold time is completely counted.” This element is not shown or suggested by either Zetts or Josephson. Based on at least the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 7 recites, in part, “a character recognition processor for performing character recognition of said stored touch screen data as a character, wherein a freshly stored touch screen data generated before completion of counting the predetermined waiting threshold time is added to the previous touch screen data to complete said character.” This element is not shown or suggested by either Zetts or Josephson. Based on at least the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 7 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 9 recites, in part, “in case that another touch screen data is generated within a predetermined waiting threshold time, stopping the above operation and adding both the previously generated touch screen data and the newly generated touch screen data together as one character to thereby perform the character recognition.” This element is not shown or suggested by either Zetts or Josephson. Based on at least the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 3, 7 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 4, 8 and 10 these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of its dependence on its respective amended

independent claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent Claims 4, 8 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 3, 4 and 7-10, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP

333 Earle Ovington Blvd.

Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel: (516) 228-8484

Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr